

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/051,230 22850 7	01/22/2002	Shinichi Kawamura	218335US0CONT	12	
•	OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			EXAMINER	
1940 DUKE ST ALEXANDRIA			RODEE, CHRISTOPHER D		
		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1756		
				DATE MAILED: 05/02/2003	
		•			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/051,230	KAWAMURA ET AL	- .			
	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Christopher D RoDee	1756				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover she t with the co	correspondenc add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 14 April 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	evoid abandonment of this applions) a timely filed amendment whical (with appeal fee); or (3) a times.	cation. A proper re-	ply to a cation in			
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of this Adverse, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moderned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date on FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE control which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the distallutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. \$ 136(a) and the appropriate fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:					
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);				
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	pelow);					
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejections:	ction(s): section 112, second par	ragraph, rejection (s	see Interview			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	d amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See	r reconsideration has been consecutive Continuation Sheet.	sidered but does NO	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>17-20,22,23,31-33,35,37-39 and 4</u>	<u>11</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-16,21,24	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-16,21,24-30,34,36,40 and 42</u> .					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapp	proved by the Exam	niner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10.□ Other:						
		CHRISTOPHER PRIMARY EXA				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the affidavit/declaration does not specify how the comparative example (representing Nagai Ex. 3) was prepared or tested. It appears that the comparative example prepared a photorecptor using the same polymer as Nagai's Ex. 3 and then tested this product in the same manner as specification pages 102 and 105 but clarification is required by declarant. More importantly, the evidence is still not commensurate in scope with the claims because the claims permit as low as 5 wt % of either or both components. As discussed in the last Office action, the claims' "scope includes a 95/5 wt % ratio of either unit to the other or as little as 5 wt % of each unit and 90 wt % of other unspecified units." The evidence does not reasonably approach the end points for a two-component copolymer (the evidence addresses a two-component copolymer having 13.1% to 79.4% of the bisphenol unit and 20.6 to 86.9% of the charge transporting moiety). The evidence also does not address a threor more component copolymer as noted above. There is no reason to believe that the evidence of record shows an unexpected result for the scope of these embodiments, which are included within the scope of the claims. There is also no discussion of Nagai in the declaration or of why the evidence presented is pertinent to Nagai. The section 103 rejections are maintained.

Ilmo